

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 4, 2003, claims 1, 4, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 203(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,408,928 to Steinke. Claims 2, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Steinke in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,259,165 to Koyama. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Steinke. As to each of the claims in the application, the Office Action indicates that the attachment bracket/hardware and the beam are not claimed in combination with the seismic adapter, stating that "the device of Steiner is inherently fully capable of performing as a seismic adapter."

Claims 1-7 are amended as indicated above to include the web joist as a limitation. The web joist of the amended claims is distinctly different from the rectangular channel disclosed in Steinke. Steinke therefore does not anticipate claims 1, 4, or 7 as amended, nor does Steinke render claim 3 obvious. Further, where Steinke does not disclose all the claimed limitations of claims 1, 4, or 7, the combination of Steinke in view of Koyama also does not disclose the web joist limitation. Claims 2, 5, and 6 are therefore not rendered obvious by the combination of Steinke in view of Koyama.

New claims 8 and 9 have been added. Claim 8 includes the attachment bracket as a limitation; claim 9 includes the beam as a limitation. In view of the comments in the Office Action, Applicant asserts that both claims 8 and 9 are directed towards subject matter that is neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited prior art.

Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

DATE: May 5, 2003

By: _____



David M. Morse
Reg. No. 50,505

Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.
865 South Figueroa Street
Twenty-Ninth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017-2576
(213) 892-9200